

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 4. The attached sheet, which includes Figure 4, replaces the original sheet including Figure 4.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1-3 are rejected. Claim 1 has been amended. New Claims 4-17 have been added for substantive examination.

Reconsideration of the objections and rejections set forth in the aforementioned Office Action is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. The basis for the amendments can be found throughout the Specification, Claims and Drawings as originally filed.

## **DRAWINGS**

The drawings stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "30" has been used to designate two elements (Figure 4). The Applicants have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheet," Figure 4 has been amended to correctly identify the half shaft element as reference character "50."

## **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matschinsky et al. (DE 31 36 125). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Matschinsky et al. does not disclose each and every element of the integrated rear suspension assembly as defined by claim 1. Claim 1 calls for a transmission cross member fixedly secured to each of the frame rails of a motor vehicle in combination with the other elements of claim 1. On the contrary, Matschinsky et al. discloses a laterally extending member 7 that terminates at support locations for springs 8 and shocks 9. Furthermore, member 7 is not fixedly secured to

each of the frame rails as recited by claim 1. The ends of member 7 are free to move. Figure 2 of Matschinsky et al. depicts the leading ends of trailing arms 15 being fixed to the vehicle frame 16. Such a mounting arrangement is not shown relating to member 7. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102 rejections to claims 1 and 2.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matschinsky et al. in view of Tatsumi et al. (EP 1,245,477). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants respectfully rely on the arguments previously set forth relating to Matschinsky et al and claim 1. As such, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103 rejection to claim 3.

### **NEW CLAIMS**

New claims 4-17 have been provided for substantive examination. The Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references cited by the Examiner, either solely or in combination with one another, anticipate or render the new claims as obvious.

### **CONCLUSION**

All of the grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the

outstanding office action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If it is believed that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1222. Prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 26, 2008

By: /Donald G. Walker/  
Donald G. Walker – Reg. No. 44390  
Attorneys for Applicants

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.  
P. O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
Phone: 248/641-1600  
Facsimile: 248/641-0270

DGW/jmm